

Mr. Speaker, this attack cannot be countenanced. This violence must end. That is why today, with my colleague from New York, Mrs. LOWEY, I am introducing the East Timor Human Rights Accountability Act. This bill simply says that no United States aid to Indonesia can be used to further the occupation of East Timor or to violate the human rights of the people of East Timor. If it is, this aid will end.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York for joining me and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in sponsoring this legislation.

DEMOCRATS SEEK TO DESTROY RATHER THAN FIGHT IDEAS OF SPEAKER GINGRICH

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, last evening the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, as we have heard, dismissed 64 of the 65 allegations against our Speaker. There will be more to come. This has been a systematic effort to destroy an individual rather than fight his ideas. There will be more to come.

The gentleman from Florida who spoke, Mr. JOHNSTON, who has been putting the privileged resolution on the floor that has been tabled twice, was quoted in his own hometown paper in Florida as having said I am part of a small group that meets weekly to pour over everything the Speaker says to find where we can file ethics charges against him.

This is an old story. We have heard it said here that in 1989 they said, and I quote, "We will destroy GINGRICH if it is the last thing we do". There will be more to come.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud that the Speaker can stick to his issues and the ideas. It is unfortunate that the other side is not willing to engage the ideas.

HISTORY BEING REWRITTEN REGARDING COMPLAINTS FILED AGAINST SPEAKER

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, history is being rewritten down here in this well today. I want to tell my colleagues that when I listen to the other side, I have heard of putting lipstick on pigs, but they are really going crazy this morning.

Now, the way I see it is, there were 6 complaints filed, not 65. Six complaints. Three of them he was declared guilty by the bipartisan Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Guilty, guilty, guilty. Three complaints. Please, let us not rewrite what has been done. It is a record of this House.

On one of the others, they moved to get a special counsel to look into it.

That is very serious. One is still pending, and there are more supposedly coming to be filed. I think these are very serious. We should not play partisan politics with this, and this is not get-even time. The Democrats don't have to do anything to Speaker GINGRICH. All we have to do is stand back and let NEWT be NEWT. He is doing it, and I think it is really causing great trouble.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT PROVIDED THOUGHTFUL AND THOROUGH CONSIDERATION OF COMPLAINTS AGAINST SPEAKER

(Ms. DUNN of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Connecticut, Congresswoman NANCY JOHNSON, and her bipartisan Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the thoughtful and thorough job that they did, the thorough consideration, and the fact that they threw out 64 of these 65 complaints against our Speaker.

I want to be clear also, Mr. Speaker. Ethics charges are serious charges, and they should not be used for partisan purposes. So I am delighted the committee has declared in a unanimous bipartisan report that 64 of the 65 charges are dismissed. And the last charge, which was a matter of tax exempt status for a university, will be observed by an outside adviser.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that Democrats are on the wrong side of history. Their ideas have been rejected by the American people and their institutions are the cause of our \$5 trillion national debt. The liberalism they have defended for a generation has left a legacy of debt, a culture of dependence and the breakdown of our American families. As they see it, the only hope left to them as a party is to destroy one man's character. It is wrong, it will not work, and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct report proves it.

SPEAKER'S PLAN TO ABOLISH MEDICAID IS BAD IDEA

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when is Speaker GINGRICH going to get it? His plan to abolish Medicaid is a bad idea. He is not listening to seniors, seniors who will lose their long-term nursing home care. He is not listening to the American Medical Association, who warned him this week not to end the Federal guaranty to health care coverage for low-income women and for children.

Let us hope he listens to the participants at yesterday's White House con-

ference on AIDS, participants who made it clear that his proposal will be devastating for people with AIDS. I wonder if my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, that half of all people with HIV and AIDS in my home State of California rely on Medicaid for health coverage? Destroy the Medicaid safety net and people with AIDS will be denied treatment and care and will be forced into expensive hospital emergency rooms.

Mr. Speaker, listen to persons with HIV and AIDS, listen to the American Medical Association, listen to seniors, women, and children. Do not pay for special interest taxes by taking away health care from the most vulnerable Americans.

LET US NOT PLAY POLITICS BUT BALANCE THE BUDGET BY 2002

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thought today with the President's budget coming out it would be a new sort of "Honesty In Congress Day," but I see the rhetoric has shifted from facts and figures and how we achieve a balanced budget to character assassination.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a joyous day for some of us, as we see the President's budget that is going to turn out very close to what the Republicans have proposed, if we are going to reach that balanced budget in 7 years. I look at Jim Glassman's column today. It says it is scandalous how close Congress and President Clinton actually are on the key elements of the Federal budget. If Americans understood these numbers, they would be outraged.

I look at the New York Times article that says White House documents reveal similarities in the GOP plans for Medicare. Mr. Glassman says, "In my own judgment, it is," that lack of the deal, is Clinton's fault.

Mr. Speaker, there is closeness to this agreement. Let us get together. Let us forget partisan politics. Let us get a balanced budget by 2002.

PRESIDENT VETOED BUDGET THAT MADE DEVASTATING CUTS IN MEDICAID AND MEDICARE

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear my Republican colleagues defending Speaker GINGRICH today. You heard that right. They are defending the Speaker they elected earlier this year. But that is not what I am here to talk about, I am here to say I am proud that the President vetoed the Republican budget yesterday with the same pen Lyndon Baines Johnson signed Medicare and Medicaid into law, because he believes

that the deep and devastating cuts in Medicare, education, and tax increases on working families is not in line with the priorities that Americans have set. Thank the Lord he vetoed that bill.

The budget made devastating cuts in Medicare and Medicaid in order to finance a tax break, a tax break before we even balance the budget. It was unacceptable and I am proud the President did that.

Now that the budget has been vetoed, let us do what my colleagues said, let us get about balancing the budget in a fair way. Democrats and Republicans alike agreed in a continuing resolution to balance the budget in a way that protects Medicare, education, the environment, and working Americans. Let us do that bipartisanship and we can have a balanced budget for all of America.

PROFESSIONAL CHARACTER ASSASSINATION

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, for the past year a small number of Members of this body have been involved in what can only be described as professional character assassination. It is an example of classic stump water politics. That is where you throw what is handy and you stress what sticks. Well, they have hurled 65 charges at our Speaker and none of them have stuck. The only remaining issue is a technical tax question.

At the Speaker's request, we have remained silent concerning the withering assault on the Speaker's character. We will be silent no longer. The stump water politics and the professional character assassination must end. The business of this Nation must proceed.

□ 1130

ETHICAL QUESTIONS REGARDING SPEAKER ARE REAL

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, throughout this morning's discussion, one would get the impression that the ethics questions we are considering here today are purely a matter of partisan politics; that is, the Democrats versus the Republicans as usual.

Some people want to count the number of complaints. Some people want to say, well, this is stump water politics. All I want to do is read what the bipartisan Democrat and Republican Committee on Standards of Official Conduct had to say, and I think the words will speak for themselves.

Referring to the Speaker, they said in a letter of December 6, 1995:

The committee strongly questions the appropriateness of what some would describe as

an attempt by you to capitalize on your office. At a minimum, this creates the impression of exploiting one's office for personal gain. Such a perception is especially troubling when it pertains to the office of the Speaker of the House, a constitutional office requiring the highest standards of ethical behavior.

Mr. Speaker, this is not back water, stump water politics or partisan politics. Both Democrats and Republicans agree there is a problem. We now have a special counsel. We will leave it to him to look into the details.

CHEAP SHOT AT CBO

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, relevant to the President vetoing the only balanced budget in a generation for reasons that do not hold water Americans should note an editorial entitled "Cheap Shot" in yesterday's Washington Post.

Senator Minority Leader Tom Daschle has recklessly attacked—without foundation and for the cheapest of political reasons—one of the most valuable institutions in the government. His problem is with the Congressional Budget Office. It was set up in 1974 to fill a void by providing Congress with dispassionate, nonpartisan analysis on which to base budget decisions. It has steadily done so . . . and in the process greatly strengthened Congress as an institution while elevating the annual debate.

Maybe someday it will fall from that high standard. That day is not yet. But Mr. Daschle is disappointed by one of CBO's current positions . . . he is free, of course, to say he disagrees . . . what he chose to do instead . . . was smear the agency.

The remarks he made undercut the very process whose integrity he pretended to protect. They did leave a stain, but not on CBO.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to voice my concerns over the education and job training cuts of \$4.5 billion in the majority party's proposed budget.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, \$4.5 billion taken out of the national education budget to cover the tax breaks for our corporate welfare community. I am a firm believer in education and its role in our society, and I have seen the success of such programs as vocational education, national student loans, and school-to-job training programs.

Mr. Speaker, take this away from our children and our dislocated workers, our working families, and we place ourselves back into a recession, an education recession.

I honestly believe, Mr. Speaker, that this institution has an obligation to this Nation to make education affordable to everyone. We have an obliga-

tion to this Nation to make education accessible to everyone. We need only to examine the benefits of the GI educational law that offered educational opportunities for the hundreds of thousands of GI's, who would not have obtained college education if this program was not provided by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all Americans should go into the 21st century with every opportunity to succeed. I believe we should give all Americans an opportunity to enhance their skills, further obtain educational knowledge to prepare themselves adequately for the job market.

If you take away this opportunity—you cut the chances for anyone to succeed. You make it that much more difficult to the average person to make ends meet.

I urge my colleagues to think seriously about the ramifications of this \$4.5 billion cut to education and job-training programs and give our children, families a break for the future.

PRESIDENT'S VETO OF BALANCED BUDGET

(Mrs. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that one of our colleagues spoke about the fact that the President vetoed the balanced budget bill yesterday that came across his desk with the pen that was used by Lyndon Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman failed to say was that that pen was out of ink. I think that is significant. The President then dipped that pen into an inkwell to give it new life, and there was no ink in the inkwell. So, the President did not veto this very important bill with Lyndon Johnson's pen, but just an ordinary pen.

Mr. Speaker, in vetoing this bill, he vetoed a bill that was so incredibly important to the American people that our telephone systems in the House and the Senate experienced meltdown because of the numerous, thousands and thousands of calls that came in not only to the House and the Senate, but also to the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that the only objection, or the only thing that the other side of the aisle can talk about is character assassination about the Speaker.

ETHICAL CLOUD LINGERS OVER HOUSE

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, after reading the report of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, it is little wonder that some of its Members drug their feet for 14 months, because it reflects a pattern of ethical abuse.